

INITIAL ASSESSMENT FORM							
I. SITE NAME AND LOCATION							
01 SITE NAME RWMC Septic Tank and Drair and 604	n Field f	or WMF-601   Ida			ADDRESS aho National Engineering coratory (INEL)		
03 CITY Scoville	0.	4 STATE Idaho	05 Z	IP CODE	06 COUNTY Butte		
09 COORDINATES: NORTH 6 6 9 6 3 0	EAS'	T 700	07 C	DUNTY CC	ODE 08 CONG. DIST.		
10 DIRECTIONS TO SITE (Sta From US 20: SW on Van Bure					ad)		
II. OWNER/OPERATOR							
01 OWNER (If known) Department of Energy (DO	Œ)	02 STRE	ET ADI				
03 CITY Idaho Falls		04 STATI Idaho	<b>I</b>				
07 OPERATOR (If known) EG&G Idaho, Inc.		08 STRE					
09 CITY Idaho Falls	10 STATI	E 11 ZIP CODE 12 TELEPHONE NUMBER 83415 (208) 526-1014					
III. CHARACTERIZATION OF F	POTENTIAL	HAZARD					
01 ON SITE INSPECTION _	YES	XX NO	DATI	Ē/_			
02 SITE STATUS (Check one)				03 Y	YEARS RECEIVED HAZ WASTE		
xx A. Active SWMU B.	Inactive	e C.	Unkno	own Sta	art Stop Unknown		
04 DESCRIPTION OF SUBSTANCE See Waste Information Sec		BLY PRESI	ENT, P	CNOWN, C	DR ALLEGED		
05 DESCRIPTION OF POTENTIA See Hazardous Conditions				T AND/O	OR POPULATION		
IV. INFORMATION AVAILABLE	FROM						
01 CONTACT 02 Clifford Clark	OF (Agend DOE-			03	TELEPHONE NUMBER (208) 526-1122		
04 PERSON RESPONSIBLE FOR ASSESSMENT Terry Alexander	05 AGEI		06 ORG. HWP		07 TELEPHONE NUMBER (208) 526-8040		
0S DATE  10/01/86  Mon Day Year							

WASTE STATES, QUANTITIES, AND CHARACTERISTICS  O1 PHYSICAL STATES (Check all that apply)  A. Solid  E. Slurry  O2 WASTE QUANTITY AT SITE								
A. SolidE. Slurry	WASTE STATES, QUANTITIES, AND CHARACTERISTICS							
B. Powder Fines xxF. Liquid TONS	_A. SolidE. Slurry _B. Powder Fines xxF. Liquid TONS							
03 WASTE CHARACTERISTICS (Check all that apply)  _A. ToxicD. PersistentG. FlammableJ. Explosive  _B. CorrosiveE. SolubleH. IgnitableK. Reactive  _C. RadioactiveF. InfectiousI. Highly VolatileL. Incompatible  _xxM. Not Applicable								
II. WASTE TYPE								
CATEGORY SUBSTANCE NAME 01 GROSS AMOUNT 02 UNIT COMMENTS  SLU Sludge OLW Oily Waste SOL Solvents PSD Pesticides OCC Other organic chemicals IOC Inorganic chemicals ACD Acids BAS Bases MES Heavy metals								
1. HAZARDOUS CONSTITUENTS  01 CATEGORY 02 SUBSTANCE NAME NUMBER NUMBER METHOD 05 CONC. 06 MEASURE NAME NUMBER NUMB								

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

<u>Use specific references, e.g., state titles, sample analysis reports, etc.)</u>

Site inspections, personnel interviews, process records, laboratory records.

	HAZARDOUS CONDITIONS AND INCIDENTS	
I.	. HAZARDOUS CONDITIONS AND INCIDENTS	
	A. GROUNDWATER CONT. 02 OBSERVED (Date) NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION:	POTENTIAL ALLEGED
	Not Applicable	
•	B. SURFACE WATER CONT. 02 OBSERVED (Date) NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION:	 POTENTIAL ALLEGED
	Not Applicable	
01 03		POTENTIAL ALLEGED
	Not Applicable	
01 03	D. FIRE/EXPLOSIVE CONDITIONS 02 OBSERVED (Date) POPULATION POTENTIALLY AFFECTED04 NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION	POTENTIA ALLEGED
	Not Applicable	
		 POTENTIAL ALLEGED
	Not Applicable	
	F. CONTAMINATION OF SOIL 02 OBSERVED (Date) _ NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION:	 POTENTIAL ALLEGED
	Not Applicable	
	G. DRINKING WATER CONTAMINATION 02 OBSERVED (Date) _ NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION:	POTENTIAL ALLEGED
	Not Applicable	

•

- PRIORITY RANKING SYSTEM
I. GENERAL FACILITY INFORMATION
FACILITY NAME: Rwmc Septic Tank and Drainfield for wmf-601,  LOCATION: West of wmf-601  POINT OF CONTACT: NAME:  ADDRESS:  PHONE:
REVIEWER: Terry Alexander DATE: 10/15/26
II. GENERAL FACILITY DESCRIPTION
GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE FACILITY: (For example: landfill, surface boundment, pile, container; types of hazardous substances; location of sility; contamination route of major concern; types of information needed for rating; agency action, etc.)  This facility receives Sewage from the Rwm ( baildings. There is no recerd of hazardous waste entering the system.
SM =
SDC = 0

HAZARDOUS CONDITIONS AND INCIDENTS
. HAZARDOUS CONDITIONS AND INCIDENTS (Continued)
01 J. DAMAGE TO FLORA 02 OBSERVED (Date) POTENTIAL 04 NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION: ALLEGED Not Applicable
01 K. DAMAGE TO FAUNA 02 OBSERVED (Date) POTENTIAL 04 NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION: (include name(s) of species) ALLEGED Not Applicable
01 L. CONTAMINATION OF FOOD CHAIN 02 OBSERVED (Date) POTENTIAL 04 NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION: ALLEGED Not Applicable
01 M. UNSTABLE CONTAINMENT OF WASTES 02 OBSERVED (Date)POTENTIAL (SPILL RUNOFF, STANDING LIQUIDS/LEAKING DRUMS) .  03 NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION: ALLEGED Not Applicable
N. DAMAGE TO OFFSITE PROPERTY 02 OBSERVED (Date) POTENTIAL NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION: ALLEGED Not Applicable
01 XX O. CONTAMINATION OF SEWERS,STORM 02 OBSERVED(Date) XX POTENTIAL DRAINS, WWTPS 04 NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION: ALLEGED Since the possible waste entering the system is unknown, there is a potential for contamination of the sewer system from normal operations.
01 P. ILLEGAL/UNAUTHORIZED DUMPING 02 OBSERVED (Date) POTENTIAL 04 NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION: ALLEGED Not Applicable
05 DESCRIPTION OF ANY OTHER KNOWN, POTENTIAL OR ALLEGED HAZARDS Not Applicable
III. COMMENTS NONE
IV. SOURCES OF INFORMATION (List specific references, e.g., state titles, sample analysis, reports) e inspections, personnel interview, disposal quantity records, EG&G-WM-6875 Installation Assessment Report, USGS Report IDO-22053 TID-4500 The Influence of Liquid Waste Disposal on the Geochemistry of Water at the NRTS.

" GROUND WATER ROUTE WORKSHEET							
RATING FACTOR	ASSIGNED VALUE (Circle one)	MULTI- PLIER	SCORE	MAX. SCORE	REF. Section		
			<u></u>		3.2		
1.ROUTE CHARACTERISTICS Depth to Aquifer of Concern	<u>(</u> ) 1 2 3	2	0	6			
Net Precipitation Permeability of the	© 1 2 3 0 1 Ø 3	1	ر 2	3 3			
Unsaturated Zone Physical State	0 1 2 3	1	3	3			
Total Route	Characteristics Score		5	15			
2.CONTAINMENT	2.CONTAINMENT 0 1 2 🕥			3	3.3		
3.WASTE CHARACTERISTICS Toxicity/Persistence "azardous Waste Quantity	1	0 0	18 8	3.4			
Total Waste	Characteristics Score		0	26			
4. Multiply lines 1 x		0	1170				
5. Divide line 4 by 1170 and multiply by 100 $Sgw = 0$							

general services

..

SURFACE WATER ROUTE WORKSHEET							
RATING	FACTOR	ASSIGNED VALUE (Circle one)	MULTI- PLIER	SCORE	MAX. SCORE		
						4.2	
Facility S Interver 1-yr. 24-7	ning Terrain nr. Rainfall	0 1 2 3 0 0 2 3 0 0 2 3	1 1 2	0	3		
Distance to Surface		_		2	б		
Physical S	State	0 1 2 ③	1	3	3		
	Total Route	Characteristics Score		6	15		
2.CONTAINME	2.CONTAINMENT 0 (1) 2 3			/	3	4.3	
Toxicity/F Hazardous	J.WASTE CHARACTERISTICS Toxicity/Persistence Hazardous Waste Quantity  O1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8			00	18 8	4.4	
	Total Waste	Characteristics Score		0	26		
4. Multiply lines 1 x 2 x 3							
5. Divide line 4 by 1170 and multiply by 100 Ssw=							

.

		AIR ROUTE WORKSH	EET				
RATING E	FACTOR	ASSIGNED VALUE (Circle one)	MULTI- PLIER	SCORE	MAX. SCORE	REF. Section	
1.HISTORIC P	RELEASE	<b>(</b> ) 45	1	0	45	5.1	
Date and I	Location:	See attached supplemen	t pages	•			
If line l	is 0, the S	Sa = 0. Enter on line	5.				
If line 1	is 45, ther	proceed to line 2.					
2.WASTE CHAP Reactivity Incompati	and	<b>⊘</b> 1 2 3	1	0	3	5.2	
Toxicity Hazardous V Quantity	Vaste	(b) 1 2 3 (c) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	3 1	0 0	9 8		
	Total Waste	Characteristics Score			20		
TARGETS pulation 4-mile Ra		0 9 12 15 <b>(3</b> ) 21 2 27 30	4 1	<b>/</b> &	30	5.3	
	Sensitive	(a) 1 2 3	2	0	6		
Land Use		0 1 2 3	1	3	3		
	Total Targe	t Scores		21	39		
4. Multipl	ly lines 1 x	: <b>2 x</b> 3		0	35100		
5. Divide line 4 by 35100 and multiply by 100 $Sa = O$							

	S	2 S
GROUNDWATER ROUTE SCORE (Sgw)	0	O
SURFACE WATER ROUTE SCORE (Ssw)	0	0
AIR ROUTE SCORE (Sa)	0	O
2 2 2 Sgw + Ssw + Sa		0
2 2 2 SQR(Sgw + Ssw + Sa)		0
2 2 2 SQR(Sgw + Ssw + Sa)/1.73 = SM		. 0

-

100

### DOCUMENTATION RECORDS FOR HAZARD RANKING SYSTEM

INSTRUCTIONS: As briefly as possible, summarize the information you used to assign the score for each factor (e.g., "Waste quantity = 4,230 drums plus 800 cubic yards of sludges"). The source of information should be provided for each entry and should be a bibliographic-type reference. Include the location of the document.

FACILITY NAME: RWMC Septic Tank and Drainfield for WMF. 601
LOCATION: West of WMF-601
DATE SCORED: 10/15/86
PERSON SCORING: Terry Alexander
primary source(s) of information:  Site visit, drawings
FACTORS NOT SCORED DUE TO INSUFFICIENT INFORMATION:

COMMENTS OR QUALIFICATIONS:

### GROUNDWATER ROUTE

OBSERVED RELEASE - Undertake Corrective Action
 Contaminants detected (3 maximum):

Nove

Rationale for attributing the contaminants to the facility:

#### 2. ROUTE CHARACTERISTICS

Depth to Aquifer of Concern

Name/description of aquifer(s) of concern:

Snake River Plain Aquiler

Depth(s) from the ground surface to the highest seasonal level of the saturated zone [water table(s)] of the aquifer of concern:

You ft

Depth from the ground surface to the lowest point of waste disposal/ storage:

10ft

Net Precipitation

Mean annual or seasonal precipitation (list months for seasonal):

9.07 inches

Mean annual lake or seasonal evaporation (list months for seasonal):

36 inches

Net precipitation (subtract the above figures):

- 26.93 inches

### Permeability of Unsaturated Zone

Soil type in unsaturated zone:

An interbedded sequence of basaltic lava flows and sedimentary deposits.

Permeability associated with soil type:

 $10^{-7}$  to  $10^{-3}$  cm/sec

### Physical State

Physical state of substances at time of disposal (or at present time for generated gases):

Loquid, solid

#### CONTAINMENT

### Containment

Method(s) of waste or leachate containment evaluated:

None

Method of highest score:

### 4. WASTE CHARACTERISTICS

### Toxicity and Persistence

Compound(s) evaluated:

None known - Sewage

Compound with highest score:

### Hazardous Waste Quantity

Total quantity of hazardous substances at the facility, excluding those with a containment score of O (Give a reasonable estimate even if quantity is above maximum):

None

Basis of estimating and/or computing waste quantity:

<u>Ide</u>	<u>ntify</u>	ing R	elease	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
1.	Pote	ntial	for Groundwater Releases from the Unit		
	0	Unit	type and design		
		•••	Does the unit type (e.g., land-based) indicate the potential for release?	_	***************************************
		-	Does the unit have engineered structures (e.g., liners, leachate collection systems, proper construction materials) designed to prevent releases to groundwater?		<u>~</u>
	0	Unit	operation		
		-	Does the unit's age (e.g., old unit) or operating status (e.g., inactive, active) indicate the potential for release?		<u>_</u>
		-	Does the unit have poor operating procedures that increase the potential for release?		
		-	Does the unit have compliance problems that indicate the potential for a release to groundwater?		_
	o	Phys	ical condition		
		-	Does the unit's physical condition indicate the potential for release (e.g., lack of structural integrity, deteriorating liners, etc.)?		<u>_</u>
	0	Loca	tional characteristics		
		-	Is the unit located on permeable soil so the release could migrate through the unsaturated soil zone?	<u>~</u>	
		-	Is the unit located in an arid area where the soil is less saturated and therefore a release has less potential for downward migration?	_	
		-	Does the depth from the unit to the uppermost aquifer indicate the potential for release?		

## Checklist for Groundwater Releases

				<u>Yes</u>	No
		-	Does the rate of groundwater flow greatly inhibit the migration of a release from the facility?	_	
		-	Is the facility located in an area that recharges surface water?		<u></u>
	0	Waste	e characteristics		
		-	Does the waste in the unit exhibit high or moderate characteristics of mobility (e.g., tendency not to sorb soil particles or organic matter in the unsaturated zone)?		<u>~</u>
		•	Does the waste exhibit high or moderate levels of toxicity?		_
2.	Evide	ence o	of Groundwater Releases		
	0	Exist	ing groundwater monitoring systems		
		-	Is there an existing system?	-1	<u>~</u>
		-	Is the system adequate?	4	<u>_</u>
		-	Are there recent analytical data that indicate a release?	<u> </u>	_
	0	Other	evidence of groundwater releases		
		<del></del>	Is there evidence of contamination around the unit (e.g., discolored soils, lack of or stressed vegetation) that indicates the potential for a release to groundwater?		_
		-	Does local well water or spring water sampling data indicate a release from the unit?		
			ne Relative Effect of the Release on Human		
Hea	ith ar	nd the	<u>Environment</u>		
1.	Expos	sure f	Potential		
	0	Cond	itions that indicate potential exposure		
		-	Are there drinking water well(s) located near the unit?		<u>~</u>
		-	Does the direction of groundwater flow indicate the potential for hazardous constituents to migrate to drinking water wells?		/

#### SURFACE WATER ROUTE

### 1. OBSERVED RELEASE - Undertake Corrective Action

Contaminants detected in surface water at the facility or downhill from it (3 maximum):

None

Rationale for attributing the contaminants to the facility:

### 2. ROUTE CHARACTERISTICS

### Facility Slope and Intervening Terrain

Average slope of facility in percent:

1%

Name/description of nearest downslope surface water:

Big Lost River

Average slope of terrain between facility and above cited surface water body in percent:

1%

Is the facility located either totally or partially in surface water?

No

Is the facility completely surrounded by areas of high elevation?

No

## 1-year 24-Hour Rainfall in Inches

less than 2 inches

Distance to Nearest Downslope Surface Water

2 miles

Physical State of Waste

Liquid, solid

#### 3. CONTAINMENT

### Containment

Method(s) of waste or leachate containment evaluated:

Buried Tank, flow through system

Method with highest score:

5 ame

				Yes	No
Ide	ntify:	ing Re	eleases .		
1.			for Surface Water/Surface Drainage Release Facility		
	o		imity to Surface Water and/or to Off-site		
		-	Could surface run-off from the unit reach the nearest downgradient surface water body?		
		-	Could surface run-off from the unit reach off-site receptors (e.g., if facility is located adjacent to populated areas and no barrier exists to prevent overland surface run-off migration)?		_
	٥	Relea	ase Migration Potential		
		-	Does the slope of the facility and intervening terrain indicate potential for release?		<u>_</u>
		-	Is the intervening terrain characterized by soils and vegetation that allow overland migration (e.g., clayey soils, and sparse vegetation)?		<u>~</u>
	-	-	Does data on one-year 24-hour rainfall indicate the potential for area storms to cause surface water or surface drainage contamination as a result of run-off?		<u>_</u>
	0	Unit	Design and Physical Condition		
		-	Are engineered features (e.g., run-off control systems) designed to prevent release from the unit?		<u>_</u>
		-	Does the operational history of the unit indicate that a release has taken place (e.g., old, closed or inactive unit, not inspected regularly, improperly maintained)?		
		-	Does the physical condition of the unit indicate that releases may have occurred (e.g., cracks or stress factures in tanks or erosion of earthen dikes of surface impoundments)?		_

# Checklist for Surface Water/Surface Drainage Releases

			<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
	0	Waste Characteristics		
		<ul> <li>Is the volume of discharge high relative to the size and flow rate of the surface water body?</li> </ul>		_
		Do constituents in the discharge tend to sorb to sediments (e.g., metals)?	_	<del></del>
		<ul> <li>Do constituents in the discharge tend to be transported downstream?</li> </ul>		<u>~</u>
		<ul> <li>Do waste constituents exhibit moderate or high characteristics of persistence (e.g., PCBs, dioxins, etc.)?</li> </ul>		<u></u>
		Do waste constituents exhibit moderate or high characteristics of toxicity (e.g., metals, chlorinated pesticides, etc.)?	·	_
2.	Evic	lence of Surface Water/Surface Drainage Releases		
	٥	Are there unpermitted discharges from the facility to surface water that require an NPDES or a Section 404 permit?		<u> </u>
	0	Is there visible evidence of uncontrolled run-off from units at the facility?		_
		ing the Relative Effect of the Release on Human		
1.	0	Are there drinking water intakes nearby?	***************************************	_
	0	Could human and/or environmental receptors come into contact with surface drainage from the facility?		<u></u>
	0	Are there irrigation water intakes nearby?		
	0	Could a sensitive environment (e.g., critical habitat, wetlands) be affected by the discharge (if it is nearby)?		

1	OBSERVED	RELEASI	f

Contaminants detected:

None

Date and Location of detection of contaminants:

Methods used to detect the contaminants:

Rationale for attributing the contaminants to the site:

### 2. WASTE CHARACTERISTICS

Reactivity and Incompatibility

Most reactive compound:

None

Most incompatible pair of compounds:

None

# <u>Toxicity</u>

Most toxic compound:

None

# <u>Hazardous Waste Quantity</u>

Total quantity of hazardous waste:

None

Basis of estimating and/or computing waste quantity:

## Checklist for Air Releases

			·	Yes	No
Ide	ntifv	ina R	eleases_		<del></del>
1.			for Air Releases from the Facility		
٠.			·		
	o	Unit	Characteristics		
		-	Is the unit operating and does is expose waste to the atmosphere?		_
		-	Does the size of the unit (e.g., depth and surface area) create a potential for air release?	-	
	0		the unit contain waste that exhibits a rate or high potential for vapor phase ase?		
		-	Does the unit contain hazardous constituents of concern as vapor releases?	******************	<u> </u>
		-	Do waste constituents have a high potential for volatilization (e.g., physical form, concentrations, and constituent-specific physical and chemical parameters that contribute to volatilization)?		<i></i>
	0	cond	the unit contain waste and exhibit site itions that suggest a moderate or high ntial for particulate release?		<u></u>
		-	Does the unit contain hazardous constituents of concern as particulate releases?	-	_
		-	Do constituents of concern as particulate releases (e.g., smaller, inhalable particulates) have potential for release via wind erosion, reentrainment by moving vehicles, or operational activities?		<i>-</i>
		-	Are particulate releases comprised of small particles that tend to travel off-site?	_	
	0		ertain environmental and geographic factors ct the concentrations of airborne contaminant:	s?	
		-	Do atmospheric/geographic conditions limit constituent dispersion (e.g., areas with atmospheric conditions that result in inversions)?	_	_
		-	Is the facility located in a hot, dry area?	_	

# Checklist for Air Releases

			<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
2.	Evide	ence of Air Releases		
	0	Does on-site monitoring data show that releases have occurred or are occurring (e.g., OSHA data)?		_
	o	Have particulate emissions been observed at the site?		
	o	Have there been citizen complaints concerning odors or observed particulate emissions from the site?		<u>~</u>
		ing the Relative Effect of the Release on Human and the Environment		
1.	Expos	sure Potential		,
	^	Is a nonulated area located near the site?		

# Checklist for Subsurface Gas Releases

			<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
 Ide	ntify	ing a Release		
1.	Pote	ntial for Subsurface Gas Releases		
	o	Does the unit contain waste that generates methane or generates volatile constituents that may be carried by methane (e.g., decomposable refuse/volatile organic wastes)?	<u>/</u>	
	o	Is the unit an active or closed landfill or a unit closed as a landfill (e.g., surface impoundments and waste piles)?		_
2.		ation of Subsurface Gas to On-site or Off-site dings		
	Q	Are on-site or off-site buildings close to the unit?		_
	0	Do natural or engineered barriers prevent gas migration from the unit to on-site or off-site buildings (e.g., low soil permeability and porosity hydrogeologic barriers/liners, slurry walls, gas control systems)?	_	_
	0	Do natural site characteristics or man-made structures (e.g., underground power trans-mission lines, sewer pipes/sand and gravel lenses) facilitate gas migration from the unit to buildings?		<u> </u>
		ing the Relative Effect of the Release on Human nd the Environment		
1.	Expo	sure Potential		
	٥	Does building usage (e.g., residential, commercial) exhibit high potential for exposure?		

#### CONTAINMENT

Hazardous substances present:

Nme

Type of containment, if applicable:

· None

## 2. WASTE CHARACTERISTICS

## Direct Evidence

Type of instrument and measurements:

None

# <u>Ignitability</u>

Compound used:

# Reactivity

Most reactive compound:

None

# **Incompatibility**

Most incompatible pair of compounds:

None

### Hazardous Waste Quantity

Total quantity of hazardous substances at the facility:

Nove

Basis of estimating and/or computing waste quantity:

#### TARGETS

Distance to Nearest Population

50 ft

Distance to Nearest Building

## Distance to Sensitive Environment

Distance to wetlands:

Greater than 100 feet

Distance to critical habitat:

Greater than 1/2 mile

#### Land Use

Distance to commercial/industrial area, if 1 mile or less:

The INEL is a research facility. There are no commercial/ industrial facilities within 1 mile.

Distance to national or state park, forest, or wildlife reserve, if 2 miles or less:

Greater than 2 miles

Distance to residential area, if 2 miles or less:

Greater than 2 miles

Distance to agricultural land in production within past 3 years, if 1 mile or less:

Greater than 1 mile

Distance to prima agricultural land in production within past 3 years, if 2 miles or less:

Greater than 2 miles

If a historic or landmark site (National Register or Historic Places and National Natural Landmarks) within the view of the site?

Great Southern Butte EBR-1 Reactor

Population Within 2-Mile Radius

572

Buildings Within 2-Mile Radius

14 . .

4	~~	~~	~ 1		7110	
	(1) M	~ _	υı	11-11	1 1847	IDENT
1.	vu.	ᅩ	т.	7 E. L.		LLICIAL

Date, location, and pertinent details of incident:

None

### 2. ACCESSIBILITY

Describe type of barrier(s):

Buried

## 3. CONTAINMENT

Type of containment, if applicable:



### 4. WASTE CHARACTERISTICS

<u>Toxicity</u>

Compounds evaluated:

alone

Compound with highest score:

# 5. TARGETS

Population within one-mile radius

33 -

Distance to critical habitat (of endangered species)

Greater than 1 mile